
From: Woolford, James
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2016 9:00 AM
To: Stalcup, Dana; Mugdan, Walter; Bilbrey, Sheryl; McLerran, Dennis; Carpenter, Angela; Fitz-James, Schatz; Fonseca, Silvina; Legare, Amy; Zhen, Davis
Subject: FW: Portland Comparison to Passaic River
Attachments: img-615133041-0001.pdf

Cami and John P have

Jim Woolford, Director
Office of Superfund Remediation & Technology Innovation
US EPA

Sent from my Windows Phone
Please excuse typos

From: [Hilosky, Nick](#)
Sent: 6/16/2016 11:14 AM
To: [Woolford, James](#)
Subject: FW: Portland Comparison to Passaic River

Also...FYI

-----Original Message-----

From: Fritz, Matthew
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 4:51 PM
To: Breen, Barry
Subject: FW: Portland Comparison to Passaic River

FYI

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Bradley [<mailto:mbradley@mjbradley.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 2:59 PM
To: Fritz, Matthew
Subject: Portland Comparison to Passaic River

Matt,

Attached are a few charts on the various cleanup options considered for the Portland site. It's caught the interest of the Passaic River CPG members in that it appears that EPA 10 has decided to pursue an adaptive management approach which as you know the CPG would support for the cleanup of the Passaic River. The amount of dredging in the Portland Alternative I option is significantly lower than several other options. The last slide compares the amount of annual dredging between Portland option I with the lower 8 miles of the Passaic as proposed by Region 2.

Thanks,
Michael